

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RSMP EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES

By consensus, the Pooled Resources Oversight Committee (PROC) recommends that the Stormwater Work Group forward these recommendations for funding the first round of RSMP Effectiveness Studies to Ecology on June 11, 2014:

1. All ten of study proposals that came out of the RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshops should move forward for the Ecology contracting process contingent upon continuing review by the PROC of the scope, schedule, and budget.
2. Four proposals should move forward this summer:
 - a. Paired Urban Small Stream Watershed Restoration Effectiveness Study
 - o A steering committee will be convened to inform the streamflow monitoring design and approach, and identify the best indicators.
 - b. Effectiveness of Bioretention in Reducing Stormwater Flows, Pollutants and Toxicity
 - o An Ecology engineer reviewed this proposal and the project proponents will respond to the comments as part of developing the QAPP.
 - c. Effectiveness of treating highway runoff to Echo Lake with LID retrofits
 - o An Ecology engineer should review this study as soon as possible.
 - d. Can bioretention prevent toxicity to coho salmon exposed to road runoff?
 - o An Ecology engineer should review this study as soon as possible.
3. PROC members should review a detailed scope of work for the first four, focusing on the proposed deliverables. The RSMP Coordinator will facilitate this process. The purposes of the review are to discern:
 - a. Is the approach scientifically and technically credible? Are the real world applications of the findings clearly articulated?
 - b. Is the proposed approach implementable within the proposed budget and schedule?
4. Do a close inspection of estimated costs in each proposal, including contracting processes and overhead rates on pass-through funding. Consider appropriate contingency funding. Find opportunities for equipment sharing or rental in lieu of purchase.
5. Do a gap analysis in advance of requesting another round of proposals in about 2 years to allocate the remainder of the funds.
6. A third party technical and scientific review of the remaining study proposals may be sought to identify fatal flaws and improve the projects.
7. Specific, project-specific suggestions for further consideration include:
 - a. Include as-built information/documentation as part of bioinfiltration study QAPPs.
 - b. Disposal costs for catch basin maintenance would require substantial additional data evaluation and should be considered as a separate, future project.
 - c. Consider adding funding for the substantial staff time that will be required to collect data for the catch basin and source controls studies.
 - d. Add an additional year of monitoring and evaluation of the wet pond in the bioretention effectiveness study.
 - e. For the hydrologic performance study, articulate what would happen if the full desired number of facilities could not be found. How would that affect the study?
 - f. For rain gardens, articulate process and early deliverable of what info the project would continue to gather. Have a steering committee of local jurisdictions help define this.